

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Kindly replace the originally filed drawings, which were objected to for being photographs, with the attached line drawings. The notice of Non-Compliant Amendment noted that the line drawings submitted on September 12, 2005 were not properly identified as "Replacement Sheet", as required by 37 CFR 1.121(d). Line drawings, properly labeled as "Replacement Sheet", are enclosed to replace the originally filed photographs which were objected to.

REMARKS:

Corrected Drawing Requirement

The requirement to submit corrected drawings in lieu of the photographs submitted at filing are duly noted. The corrected drawings are being submitted simultaneously with the current amendment, the corrected drawings being labeled "Replacement Sheet" h.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC §103

Claims 1-3 and 8-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koehler in view of any of Clark, Pearson or Tovar. This rejection is well taken and claims 1-3 have been cancelled.

Claims 1-3 and 8-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walsh et al. in view of any of Clark, Pearson or Tovar. This rejection is well taken and claims 1-3 have been cancelled.

Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walsh et al. in view of any of Clark, Pearson or Tovar, and further in view of Crookston ('671). This rejection

is well taken.

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koehler in view of any of Clark, Pearson or Tovar, and further in view of Crookston ('629). This rejection is objected to because the references relied upon do not meet the limitations of claim 7. Claim 7 requires that the cutting means comprising a blade housing which comprises a depression in one face of the second, bitted end of the head, a first end of which is open to the bitted end, the depression sized and configured to adjustably receive a utility knife blade therein. Crookston ('629), which is relied upon to meet the claimed limitations of the cutting means does not disclose the depression as claimed. This can be clearly seen by looking at any of Figs. 2, 3, 5, or 6 of Crookston, where it can be observed that the blade lies external to one flat face of one end of the head, not within a depression formed within the face. Claim 7 has been rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of claims 1 and 2 from which it depended. In view of the fact that the limitations of claim 7 is not met by the prior art relied upon for the rejection, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider claim 7 and indicate its allowability.

Newly added claim 12, which depends from claim 7, was added

to bring out further details regarding the cutting means, namely that an exposed side of the utility knife blade lies flush with the face of the second, bitted end of the head in which the depression of the blade housing is formed, and the head of the threaded bolt contacts both the utility knife blade and the face of the second, bitted end of the head. This can best be seen in Figs. 2 and 4.

Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walsh in view of any of Clark, Pearson or Tovar, and further in view of Crookston ('629). Claim 11 requires that the cutting means comprising a blade housing which comprises a depression in one face of the second, bitted end of the head, a first end of which is open to the bitted end, the depression sized and configured to adjustably receive a utility knife blade therein. As discussed above in the remarks pertaining to the rejection of claim 7, no such depression forming a blade housing is found in the Crookston ('629) reference. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider claim 11 and indicate its allowability.

Allowable subject matter

Claims 4 and 5 were objected as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but was indicated to be allowable if

rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 4 was rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and is now believed to be allowable, as is claim 5, which depends from claim 4. Claims 6, 8, and 9 (from which claim 10 depends) have been rewritten to depend from claim 4, and are therefore also believed to be allowable.

CONCLUSION:

In light of the present amendments to the claims and for the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all the claims now pending in the present application are allowable, and the present application is in condition for allowance. No new matter has been added by the present amendment. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the application in light of the amendment and remarks is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Randy Shay".

Randy Shay
Agent for Applicant
Registration No. 44,055
Siemens Patent Services, L.C.
P.O. Box 2607
Fairfax, VA 22031
(540) 548-4404